

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/631,376	07/30/2003	Eric J. Bergman	54008.8033.US00 P03-0004	2135
45540 7:	590 04/13/2005		EXAMI	NER
PERKINS COIE LLP/SEMITOOL PO BOX 1208			EL ARINI, ZEINAB	
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1208			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1746	
			DATE MAILED: 04/13/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Cummons	10/631,376	BERGMAN, ERIC J.				
Office Action Summary .	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Zeinab E. EL-Arini	1746				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication if the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by so Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report. In reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI	(30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3	31 January 2005.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ 3	_					
3) Since this application is in condition for all	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice und	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1,2,7,9,10 and 12-32 is/are pendi	Claim(s) 1,2,7,9,10 and 12-32 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)						
Applicant may not request that any objection to		· ·				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co		• • •				
	e Examiner. Note the attached t	Office Action of John PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents.	nents have been received.					
	 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 					
application from the International Bu		eceived in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a		eceived.				
	•					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		mmary (PTO-413)				
2)		Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

10/631,376

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment and remarks filed 01/31/05 have been acknowledged and entered.

Claims 1-2, 7, 9-10, and 12-32 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7, 9-10, and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 7, 9-10, line 2, "the HF vapor" lacks antecedent basis.

10/631,376

Art Unit: 1746

In claim 13, lines 7-8, "spraying DI water onto a surface of the wafer with the HF" is confusing term.

Claim 14 is confusing in the recitation of "the anhydrous HF gas are mixed with one another".

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

10/631,376

Art Unit: 1746

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-2, 13-16, 19-22, 24-27, and 29-31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-11, 16, 17-19, and 26-27 of copending Application No. 10/917,094. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the process as claimed in both applications is functionally equivalent.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10/631,376

Art Unit: 1746

Claims 1-2, 13-15, 19-22, 26, and 29-30 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 7-15 of copending Application No. 10/975,104. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the process as claimed in both applications is functionally equivalent.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10/631,376

Art Unit: 1746

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zazzera et al.

The rejection in paper No. 111704 is maintained.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-2, 7, 9-10, 12, 29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by DeGendt et al. (6,551,409).

10/631,376

Art Unit: 1746

DeGendt et al. disclose a method of etching silicon wafer comprising placing the wafer into a process chamber; forming aqueous liquid layer on the surface of the wafer, delivering ozone gas, and delivering HF into the chamber with HF etching the oxidized silicon layer as claimed. The carrier gas is ozone and the HF vapor. The reference discloses the step of removing the etched oxidized silicon from the process chamber via a system exhaust is inherent in the DeGendt et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

10/631,376

Art Unit: 1746

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-18, 19-28, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeGendt et al. in combination with EP 782177.

DeGendt et al as discusses supra disclose all limitation with the exception of spraying DI water onto a surface of the wafer, forming microscopic aqueous body layer on the surface of the wafer with DI water, the rinsing and the spinning step as claimed.

EP'177 discloses a method for etching semiconductor wafer. The reference discloses spraying rinsing, and spinning as claimed.

10/631,376

Art Unit: 1746

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the spraying, the rinsing, spinning taught by EP'177 in the DeGendt et al. to obtain the process as claimed. The limitation of claim 19 is inherent in DeGendt et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 7, 9-10, and 12-32 has been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's argument with respect to Zazzera et al. is unpersuasive because the claim does not exclude using UV.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zeinab E. EL-Arini whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Page 10

10/631,376

Art Unit: 1746

1301. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

10/631,376

Art Unit: 1746

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Zeinah Elaini Zeinab E. EL-Arini Primary Examiner Art Unit 1746

ZEE 04/11/05